

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. The replacement drawing of FIG. 4 submitted on 12/27/2005 has been objected to because it introduces a new matter, and has not been entered by the Examiner.

Drawings

Under the heading of "Drawings" on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the replacement drawing submitted on December 27, 2005 as introducing new matter. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The replacement drawing merely illustrates what was already described in the text of the specification and in FIG. 2, and therefore does not introduce new matter. At page 10, lines 30 and 31, the specification describes the "... emulator 20 running on the target processor 31 in a translation mode." The replacement drawing now shows the emulator running on the target processor, as described in the text, and does not add any subject matter that was not in the specification at the time of filing. The Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw this objection and enter the replacement drawing.

Claims Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,199,152, in view of Le, U.S. Pat. No. 6,631,514. In these rejections, the Examiner merely repeats his rejections from the earlier, non-final Office Action of August 25, 2005. In his "Response to Arguments" on page 7 of the present Office Action the Examiner merely restates the earlier text regarding Le (*i.e.*, that which is presented at page 6, lines 15-19). However, the Applicant presented arguments in the previous response as to why the Examiner's citation to Le does not apply, but the Examiner provides no comment or reasoning with respect to those arguments. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to remove the finality of this Office Action, so that the Examiner can provide a substantive response to the Applicant's detailed arguments put forward in the Applicant's reply of 22 December 2005.


Please re-evaluate the Applicant's arguments presented in section C, pages 8 and 9 regarding Le. In particular, the Applicant notes that the Examiner concentrates on the language "in an alternative way" or "in an alternative manner," which does not appear in any of the

claims. Hence, there seems to be an incorrect understanding of the claimed invention as set out in the independent claims 1, 9, 12, 13, 14 & 15, which instead each refer to "alternating mapping of the abstract register between the first and second location" such that (at a particular point in time) one of the locations represents a definitive version whilst the other location represents a speculative version of the abstract register. Clearly, at another point in time, the roles of the two locations are reversed. This mapping alternates between the two locations. Quite simply, neither Kelly nor Le disclose this feature of "alternating mapping...." of the claimed invention.

In view of the above remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. No fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response, however the Commissioner is authorized to debit Deposit Account No. 08-0219 for any required fee necessary to maintain the pendency of this application.

Should the Examiner still not feel able to issue a Notice of Allowance for any reason, the Applicant requests that the Examiner grant a personal interview. Applicant submits that a personal interview would be the most next appropriate step in order to better understand any remaining objections that the Examiner may have and to expediently resolve prosecution of this application. To arrange such an interview, please telephone the undersigned Attorney.

Dated: 7/11/2006

Respectfully submitted,


Ronald R. Demsher
Registration No.: 42,478
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 526-6000 (telephone)
(617) 526-5000 (facsimile)